arXiv:cond-mat/0703536v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 21 Mar 2007

Spin Configurations and Activation Gaps of the Quantum Hall States in Graphene

Tapash Chakraborty[‡] and Pekka Pietiläinen[†]
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada
[†]*Department of Physical Sciences/Theoretical Physics,*
P.O. Box 3000, FIN-90014, University of Oulu, Finland

We report on our accurate evaluation of spin polarizations of the ground state and particle-hole gaps for partially-filled lowest Landau level, observed in recent experiments on graphene subjected to ultra-high magnetic fields. We find that inter-electron interactions are important at these filling factors, characterized by the non-degenerate ground states and large particle-hole gaps at infinitely large wave vectors. The gaps are the largest for the quantum Hall states in the second Landau level. The weak appearence of quantum Hall plateaus in the experiments for certain filling factors in the second Landau level however indicates that at these filling factors, the system has a soft mode at a finite wave vector due presumably to the presence of disorder.

PACS numbers: 73.43.-f,71.10.-w

In recent experimental work, an atomically thin, two-dimensional (2D) sheet of graphite, called graphene has been extracted by micromechanical cleavage [1]. A two-dimensional electron system in graphene exhibits many remarkable properties. In the band structure calculations where electrons are treated as hopping on a hexagonal lattice [2], one finds a unique *linear* (relativistic type) energy dispersion near the corners of the first Brillouin zone where the conduction and valence bands meet. As a consequence, the low-energy excitations follow the Dirac-Weyl equations for massless relativistic particles [3]. In an external magnetic field, the spectrum develops into Landau levels, each of which approximately fourfold degenerate [4, 5]. Recent discovery of the quantum Hall effect in graphene [6, 7, 8] has resulted in intense activities [9, 10, 11] to unravel the electronic properties of graphene that are distinctly different from the conventional (or, as commonly called the 'non-relativistic') 2D electron systems in semiconductor structures.

Graphene has a honeycomb lattice structure of sp^2 carbon atoms, with two atoms A and B per unit cell (i.e., a two-dimensional triangular Bravais lattice with a basis of two atoms). Each atom is tied with its three nearest neighbors via strong σ bonds that are in the same plane with angles of 120°. The π orbit ($2p_z$) of each atom is perpendicular to the plane and overlaps with the π orbitals of the neighboring atoms that results in the delocalized π and π^* bands. There is only one electron in each π orbit and the Fermi energy is located between the π and π^* bands [12]. The dynamics of electrons in graphene is described by a nearest-neighbor tight-binding model [2] that describes the hopping of electrons between the $2p_z$ carbon orbitals. The first Brillouin zone is hexagonal and at two of its inequivalent corners (the K and K′ points) the conduction and valence bands meet. Graphene is often described as a two valley (K and K′) zero-gap semiconductor. Near these two points (the so-called Dirac points), the electrons have a relativistic-like dispersion relation, $\varepsilon_k = \pm\hbar v|\mathbf{k}|$ and obey the Dirac-Weyl equations for massless fermions. At the vanishing gate voltage, the system is half-filled and the Fermi level lies at the Dirac points.

In graphene, discovery of the Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy} = \nu_G e^2/h = 2(2n+1)e^2/h$, where n is an integer has indeed confirmed the Dirac nature of the electrons in that system [6]. This result has been explained as an outcome of four times the quantum Hall conductivity $(n+\frac{1}{2})e^2/h$ for each Dirac fermion, that is consistent with the four-fold degeneracy (two spins and two valleys, or flavors) of the Landau levels for the Dirac fermions [8]. In this paper, we however focus our attention to the extreme quantum limit. In the very high magnetic field regime (up to 45 Tesla), Zhang et al. [7] discovered a new set of quantum Hall states at filling factors $\nu_G = 0, \pm 1, \pm 4$. Observation of these states clearly indicated that the four-fold degeneracy of the observed states at $\nu_G = \pm 4(n+\frac{1}{2})$ has been lifted in the presence of these ultra-high fields. According to Nomura and MacDonald [13], appearence of the half- and quarter-filled lowest Landau levels are a consequence of quantum Hall ferromagnetism induced by the electron-electron interactions. The absence of certain Hall plateaus, such as at $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5$ are then attributed to the presence of disorder in the system.

Alicea and Fisher [14] performed a comprehensive exploration of alternative mechanisms for these intermediate quantum Hall states in clean and dirty graphene samples. In particular, they looked for mechanisms which explicitly could break the inherent symmetries of graphene. They started from the lattice scale with a Hubbard type model introducing inter- and intra-sublattice interactions to break the underlying SU(4) symmetry of the ideal graphene lattice. In the ferromagnetic (clean samples) regime they found the system to favor flavor polarizations at filling factors $\nu_G = \pm 1$. The strength of interactions relative to the Zeeman coupling determines whether the system is polarized or unpolarized at $\nu_G = 0$. In the higher Landau levels, these authors predicted that skyrmions would provide the minimum energy charge excitations. At the filling factor $\nu_G = \pm 4$, interactions lead to a spin-polarized ground state whereas the states at $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5$ break spontaneously the flavor symmetry. In the paramagnetic (dirty samples) regime the quantum Hall states may be possible at $\nu_G = 0, \pm 1, \pm 4$ but not at $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5$.

The question of the absence of QH steps at $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5$ in the experiment has been raised by Fuchs and Lederer [15], who, as opposed to the models described above, suggest that electron-electron interactions play no role in the formation of integer quantum Hall states. Instead they propose that the inversion symmetry of graphene is spontaneosly broken by a magnetic field dependent Pierls distortion. In the lowest Landau level this leads to the splitting of the valley degeneracy. This combined with the Zeeman splitting explains the existense of the observed Hall plateaus at intermediate filling factors $\nu_G = 0, \pm 1$. In the higher Landau levels, however, the lattice distortion cannot lift the valley degeneracy. This leaves only the Zeeman splitting leading to intermediate plateaus only at $\nu_G = \pm 4, \pm 8, \ldots$.

We however believe that inter-electron interactions play an important role for the QH states at partially-filled $\nu_G = 1$ that do or do not appear as QH steps in the experiments. In this paper, we set out to accurately determine the spin configurations and activation gaps of various integer filling factors that we expect to shed light on the nature of these states as well as provide a better understanding of the source of lifting of degeneracy for these states. In conventional quantum Hall states at partially filled Landau levels the electron-electron Coulomb interaction opens up an excitation gap between the different, otherwise degenerate eigenstates of the total spin. In graphene, an additional mechanism is necessary to lift also the degeneracy between the eigenstates of the total flavor pseudospin. Motivated by the lattice scale studies by Alicea and Fisher [14] we introduce into our Hamiltonian a term which on the lowest Landau level maps to a charge imbalance between the sublattices. We found that the ground states of $\nu_G = \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3$, etc. are non-degenerate, and they have large particle-hole gaps at asymptotically large wave vectors – the quasiparticle-quasihole gap for the fractional filling factors [16, 17], which is in fact, the activation gap. Interestingly, that gap is much larger for the QH states at the $n = 1$ Landau level, as compared to that in other Landau levels, which is in line with earlier analysis of the effects of Coulomb interactions [18, 19] in graphene. However, in the experiments [7] reported as yet, the absence (or weak presence) of the QH states at $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5$, etc. would imply that the system has a soft mode at a finite wave vector, which might arise due to disorder [14] in the system.

In our model the electrons reside on the surface of a torus formed from a rectangular cell of sides L_x and L_y by imposing periodic boundary conditions in both x and y directions. Choosing the Landau gauge $\vec{B} = \nabla \times (0, Bx, 0)^T$, we get the two-component wavefunctions

$$\Phi^K_{nm}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -i\,\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)\,\phi_{n-1,m}(x,y) \\ \phi_{nm}(x,y) \end{pmatrix}$$

for the valley K and

$$\Phi^{K'}_{nm}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{nm}(x,y) \\ -i\,\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)\phi_{n-1,m}(x,y) \end{pmatrix}$$

for the valley K'. Here n is the Landau level index and λ is its energy $\pm\sqrt{2n}$ in units of γ/ℓ, where ℓ is the magnetic length defined as $\ell^2 = c\hbar/eB$. In the case of the lowest Landau level, $n = 0$, the components with $n-1$ in the above functions are taken to be zero. The component wavefunctions ϕ_{nm} are the Laundau wavefunctions for the non-relativistic systems,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{nm}(x,y) &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}L_y\ell 2^n n!}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\times \sum_{q=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(qL_x - X_m)y/\ell^2} e^{-(x+qL_x-X_m)^2/2\ell^2} \\ &\times\ H_n\left((x+qL_x-X_m)/\ell\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the centers X_m of the harmonic oscillations are given by

$$X_m = \frac{2\pi\ell^2}{L_y}\, m.$$

Due to the periodic boundary conditions, the quantum number m yielding non-equivalent wavefunctions is restricted to the values $m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1$, where M is the degeneracy of the Landau level and also equal to the number of flux quanta through the rectangle, i.e.,

$$M = \frac{L_x L_y}{2\pi\ell^2}.$$

We diagonalize the interaction Hamiltonian

$$H_{ee} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j=1}^{N_e} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j|}$$

in the basis

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \Phi^K_{nm} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \Phi^{K'}_{nm} \end{pmatrix} \middle|\, m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1 \right\}$$

of the four-component vectors. When appended with the spin degree of freedom we have effectively a set of eight-component vectors making the base prohibitively large for practical computations. We can, however decrease the number of basis states by noting first that there is no spin dependent term in our Hamiltonian (Zeeman energies can always be added afterwards) so the total S_z is a good quantum number. If we fix S_z to its minimum value (0 or 1/2) the base is significantly reduced but it still allows us to recover all possible eigenstates of the total S^2. Secondly, because the Coulomb interaction preserves the quantity $m = \sum_i m_i \bmod M$, performing diagonalization separately for each m reduces the size of the basis further approximately to the $1/M$-th part.

We are still left with the flavor symmetry associated with the valleys K and K' leading to the degenerate ground states. Because on the lowest Landau level in the valley K (K') only the sublattice B (A) component of the wavefunction differs from zero the electron occupation of the valleys maps directly to the occupation of the sublattices. We also know that the electrostatic energy is minimized if the electrons reside only in one of the sublattices (see [14]). We utilize this fact by introducing the symmetry breaking term

$$V_{KK} = v_{KK} \sum_{i \neq j = 1}^{N_e} \vec{K}_i \cdot \vec{K}_j,$$

where $\vec{K}$ is the pseudospin operator which is identical to the spin operators $\vec{S}$ but works in the flavor (or valley) space. Introduction of this term in the Hamiltonian would imply that either one distributes the charge evenly ($v_{KK} > 0$, K_i and K_j antiparallel) between both A and B sublattices or favor one of the sublattices ($v_{KK} < 0$, K_i and K_j parallel) over the other. The latter option applies then only to the lowest Landau level. In the higher Landau levels this interpretation is not valid since the wavefunctions there have equal weight on both sublattices and the pseudospin operator cannot redistribute the charges. Therefore, the purpose of the $\vec{K} \cdot \vec{K}$ term in the present case is only to lift the valley degeneracy. We may also speculate (consistently with the experiments) that this kind of symmetry-breaking term exists only in the lowest Landau level while in the higher levels a new (yet unknown) mechanism may operate with increasing magnetic fields.

To construct the interaction Hamiltonian we need to evaluate the two-body matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{n_1m_1,n_2m_2,n_3m_3,n_4m_4} \\ &\quad = \int \mathrm{d}\vec{r}_1 \int \mathrm{d}\vec{r}_2 \; \phi^*_{n_1m_1}(\vec{r}_1)\phi^*_{n_2m_2}(\vec{r}_2)\, \frac{e^2}{\epsilon|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} \\ &\quad \times \phi_{n_3m_3}(\vec{r}_2)\phi_{n_4m_4}(\vec{r}_1). \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward but lengthy algebra leads to the explicit expression

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{n_1m_1,n_2m_2,n_3m_3,n_4m_4} \\ &\quad = \mathcal{N}_{n_1n_2n_3n_4} {\sum}'_{\alpha,\beta} e^{i2\pi\alpha(m_1-m_3)/m_{\max}} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\pi(\alpha^2+\beta^2\lambda^2)/(\lambda m_{\max})} \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+\lambda^2\beta^2}} Z_{n_1n_4}(\alpha,\beta) Z_{n_3n_2}(-\alpha,\beta), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the normalization constant and we have defined the quantities Z as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{nn'}(\alpha,\beta) &= \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\lambda M}}(i\alpha + \mathrm{sgn}(n-n')\beta\lambda)\right)^{|n-n'|} \\ &\times L^{|n-n'|}_{\min(n,n')}\left(\frac{\pi}{\lambda M}\left(\alpha^2+\beta^2\lambda^2\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the summation (with prime) the term with $\alpha = \beta = 0$ is excluded and the index β is restricted to the values $\beta = kM + m_4 - m_1;\ k = 0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots$. For the nonzero matrix elements the quantum numbers m_i must satisfy the conservation law $m_1 + m_2 = m_3 + m_4 \bmod M$.

We have evaluated the total spin S, the ground state energy $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{coul}}$ (the Landau level energy is not included) and the activation gap (defined as the positive discontinuity of the chemical potential μ) [16, 20], a measurable quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g &= \mu_+ - \mu_- \\ &\approx -2N_e\varepsilon(\nu_G) + N_e\varepsilon(\nu_G^+) + N_e\varepsilon(\nu_G^-) \end{aligned}$$

for Landau levels $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and for filling factors $\nu_L = N_e/M$ with N_e electrons and M flux quanta in the Landau level at issue. Here $+(-)$ refers to the case when a particle is added to (subtracted from) the system, and $\varepsilon(\nu_G)$ is the total energy of the system at the filling factor ν_G. The filling factor ν_G for graphene is related to the conventional (i.e., non-relativistic) filling factor [16] $\nu_L + 4n$ as

$$\nu_G = \nu_L + 4n - 2.$$

Our results for various integer filling factors are summarized in Table I and Table II for systems containing $N_e = 4-12$ electrons. Clearly, the total spin is $S = N_e/2$ for the filling factor $\nu_L = 1$ and $S = 0$ for the filling factor $\nu_L = 2$ that are independent of the Landau levels. The ground state (correlation) energies and the activation gaps are presented in Table I for a system with four flux quanta and in Table II in the case of six flux quanta. Due to the particle-hole symmetry the states with $\nu_G = 4n \pm 1$ are equivalent and the ones with $\nu_G = 4n + 2$ correspond to completely filled Landau levels. Therefore they are not shown here. In our calculations, we have used the value -0.001 in units of Coulomb energy for v_{KK}. It should

TABLE I: The Coulomb energy, the activation gap, and the ground state spin for four and eight electrons and four flux quanta. Here n is the Landau level index, $\varepsilon_{\rm coul}$, and Δ are in units of the Coulomb energy ($e^2/\epsilon l$, $\epsilon = 1$).

$\nu_L = 4/4$				
n	ν_G	$\varepsilon_{\rm coul}$	Δ	S
0	-1	–0.6457	0.5480	2
1	3	–1.0101	1.3256	2
2	7	–0.6587	0.5800	2
3	11	–0.5719	0.3976	2

$\nu_L = 8/4$				
n	ν_G	$\varepsilon_{\rm coul}$	Δ	S
0	0	–0.6457	0.5480	0
1	4	–1.0100	1.2632	0
2	8	–0.6559	0.5520	0
3	12	–0.5707	0.4720	0

TABLE II: Same as in Table I, but for six and twelve electrons and six flux quanta.

$\nu_L = 6/6$				
n	ν_G	$\varepsilon_{\rm coul}$	Δ	S
0	-1	–0.6368	0.6546	3
1	3	–1.1568	1.7256	3
2	7	–0.7947	0.9810	3
3	11	–0.5662	0.5118	3

$\nu_L = 12/6$				
n	ν_G	$\varepsilon_{\rm coul}$	Δ	S
0	0	–0.6368	0.6432	0
1	4	–1.1569	1.6908	0
2	8	–0.7947	0.9600	0
3	12	–0.5656	0.5004	0

be pointed out, however, that the results presented in the tables are not sensitive to the magnitude of this parameter: in fact, an infinitesimal value would be sufficient to yield, e.g., the total spins.

The non-degenerate ground states (at zero wave vector) for these filling factors, as well as large activation gap that appears at the very large wave vector [16, 17] implies that the system is incompressible at these filling factors. Interestingly, as the results indicate, the activation gap is always the largest for $n = 1$ Landau level. As mentioned above, this is in line with earlier works [18, 19], where electron correlations were found to be dominant for the $n = 1$ Landau level than for all the other Landau levels, a significant shift from the conventional 2D electron systems. In the present case that would mean that the quantum Hall states should be most stable for $\nu_G = \pm 3, \pm 5, ...$ but in fact, they are conspicuously absent in the reported experimental results [7]. Given the incompressible nature of these states for the large wave vector and for the zero wave vector as found above, we can only conclude from this apparent contradiction that these states must exhibit soft modes at a finite wave vector, perhaps due to the presence of disorder [13, 14], or maybe due to a mechanism of the type proposed in [15] that inhibits the opening of the gap at small wave vectors.

We would like to thank Jason Alicea for helpful discussions. The work has been supported by the Canada Research Chair Program, a Canadian Foundation for Innovation Grant and the NSERC Discovery grant.

[‡] Electronic address: tapash@physics.umanitoba.ca

[1] K.S. Novoselov, et al., PNAS **102**, 10451 (2005); Science **306**, 666 (2004); Y. Zhang, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 176803 (2005).

[2] P.R. Wallace, Phys. Rev. **71**, 622 (1947).

[3] T. Ando, in *Nano-Physics & Bio-Electronics: A New Odyssey*, edited by T. Chakraborty, F. Peeters, and U. Sivan (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2002), Chap. 1.

[4] J.W. McClure, Phys. Rev. **104**, 666 (1956); R.R. Haering and P.R. Wallace, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **3**, 253 (1957).

[5] Y. Zheng and T. Ando, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 245420 (2002).

[6] K.S. Novoselov, et al., Nature **438**, 197 (2005); Y. Zhang, Y.-W. Tan, H.L. Störmer, and P. Kim, *ibid.* **438**, 201 (2005).

[7] Y. Zhang, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 136806 (2006).

[8] V.P. Gusynin and S.G. Sharapov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 146801 (2005); E. McCann and V.I. Fal'ko, *ibid.* **96**, 086805 (2006).

[9] A.K. Geim and K.S. Novoselov, Nature Mat. **6**, 183 (2007).

[10] M.I. Katsnelson, Materials Today **10**, 20 (2007).

[11] T. Chakraborty, Physics in Canada **62**, 351 (2006).

[12] R. Saito, G. Dresselhaus, and M.S. Dresselhaus, *Physical Properties of Carbon nanotubes* (Imperial College Press, London, 1998).

[13] K. Nomura and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 256602 (2006).

[14] J. Alicea and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 075422 (2006).

[15] J.-N. Fuchs and P. Lederer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 016803 (2007).

[16] T. Chakraborty and P. Pietiläinen, *The Quantum Hall Effects* (Springer, Heidelberg, 1995), 2nd edition.

[17] C. Kallin and B.I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 5655 (1984).

[18] M.O. Goerbig, R. Moessner, and B. Doucot, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 161407 (2006).

[19] V.M. Apalkov and T. Chakraborty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 126801 (2006).

[20] T. Chakraborty, P. Pietiläinen, and F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 130 (1986).